

9376

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

May 4, 1966

the eternal triangle of the atmospheric nuclear test ban treaty against the need for shelter protection, which is on the second corner of the triangle, or against the need to shoot down enemy missiles and delivery capabilities before they become effective over us and in our own atmosphere on the other corner of the triangle—I am not at all sure that that is confirmed by their own statute. This is truly a time for concern for all America. This is a time for research and for probing. This is a time for informing the public, because, as Lord Byron said over 100 years ago, the informed are easy to lead but difficult to drive, easy to govern but impossible to enslave. I think a great service has been rendered today to this Nation by the gentleman from California in his erudite and succinct comments. I rise in appreciation and I would like to associate myself with his views.

Mr. HOSMER. The gentleman is very kind and generous and also very wise in what he has hinted at as to what may be the purpose of this intellectual argument about deploying an antiballistic missile defense. Now, you either want that kind of protection against a potential enemy or you do not want that kind of protection against a potential enemy. If you do not want it, you ought to say so. If you do want it, then you ought to come down, if you are the President or the Secretary of Defense, to the Congress of the United States and say, "Give us the money to buy it." The U.S. national interest and possibly its life is at stake. But what do we get? Neither one of those. We simply get a lot of hocus-pocus about playoffs between missile-destroying systems, civil defense systems, fallout shelters, bomb shelters, plus all of the semantics that go with this game that they developed down at the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. So we have the issue confused and ambiguous rather than drawn for the people as this kind of discussion ought to draw an issue for an intelligent electorate to decide upon.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I know that he full well recognizes that in the present state of research and development of these antiballistic missile deployments or the anti-delivery capability means, that is, the antimissile missile—whether you refer to the Sprint modification of the Nike-Zeus or the Nike X or anything else—it would be at least 4 years hence even if fully implemented and continued at this time. Having been struck down once insofar as the Army action agency is concerned, it seems to me it will behooves the Commander in Chief or the Secretary of Defense not to continue funding if they feel that it is necessary today in the 1967 fiscal budget, but the Committee on Armed Services in its wisdom has seen fit to restore some of that. It seems to me that bill will be before the House for complete development in the next 2 weeks, and we will be given a chance to work our will on this part. But this has happened in so many cases where Congress is ex-

pected to restore the cut funds in order that a budget may be within the obligation authority or indeed the spending authority of the President for any one fiscal year, to say nothing of borrowing from it for supplemental needs.

Does not the gentleman agree with me that if we are to be able to shoot down a missile coming in from an enemy, from any source, that we should work hard and use all of our research and brains and everything else that we have at this time on this problem?

Mr. HOSMER. I believe the gentleman is precisely correct in his assessment of the situation.

However, I do want to say this: If we are to take the Secretary of Defense at his word, as we are continually asked to do, both by himself and others, and if his word is that we do not have a warhead suitable to go on this antiballistic missile system to be used over our heads, if we do not have a clean enough one that we cannot keep our own people from falling victims of fallout, then the first step to be taken is a most vigorous program of developing such a warhead and to achieve it, so that then we can start to design our system around it.

We simply just do not know the "kill" characteristic of a warhead. You have to know its weight, you have to know its volume, and all of those other things before you design the other parts and pieces of a missile system of which the warhead is the heart, and whose characteristics must necessarily determine the other characteristics of the system.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOSMER. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding further because I am one who has long since quit believing the statements of the Secretary of Defense, and have so stated on the floor of this House.

Secondly, would the gentleman from California not agree with me, that regardless of research, it would require exoatmospheric testing under the fireball or the electromagnetic testing of any such warhead before we could know the answer to the question that he has so well posed?

Mr. HOSMER. Certainly there is never an assurance that anything will work until it is actually tested under the conditions and in the environment which is exoatmospheric in this case, with which it is supposed to be employed.

You can simulate some of these conditions but you can never achieve them fully in underground testing.

However, since we have obliged ourselves by treaty to limit our testing to the underground—we have banned it in the atmosphere, we have banned it in space and under water—the only place left is in holes underneath the ground. We have to take that with which we have to work and do the job under the circumstances of underground testing.

Now, at the same time, we have facing us this constant yen, desire, effort, or mood on the part of the administration even to rid ourselves of the underground testing. They say, "Well, if you do not

have them, and the other fellow does not have them, you are even."

However, Mr. Speaker, you are not only even, I say to the gentleman from Missouri, if you start out even and if anyone wants to look into the record of the last series of atmospheric tests before the limited ban treaty, I believe there is considerable reason for even the layman to conclude that the emphasis which the Soviet Union placed upon its tests very high in the sky and emphasis that the United States did not share in those tests, I believe the conclusion reasonably could be that we are not starting even on that one.

STOP MEKONG RIVER. "BACK-DOOR" AID TO THE VIETCONG

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KREBS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. CHAMBERLAIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I have many times in the past months voiced my deep concern over the assistance given the war economy of North Vietnam by ships flying the flags of free world countries. At long last, this past February the administration finally decided to no longer openly tolerate this trade with the belligerent Hanoi regime by blacklisting the free world ships involved from receiving any U.S. Government contracts. In placing trade with Ho Chi Minh on the same level as trade with Castro, the world was put on notice that the United States considered this flow of goods detrimental to the efforts being made in South Vietnam to resist Communist aggression. While I remain greatly disturbed over the way that the true nature and extent of free world trade with North Vietnam has been kept from the American people through the arbitrary, unjustified, and self-serving use of secret classifications designed more to protect ineffective policies, rather than our security, I am encouraged by the most recent report which I have seen which indicates a reduction in this traffic, I hasten to add, however, that I will not be satisfied so long as there is one free world ship docking at Haiphong.

CAMBODIAN TRADE: THE VIETCONG'S "BACK-DOOR" AID

Today, however, I wish to speak of a closely related problem; one which, while it is more difficult to measure, I am satisfied has had an adverse effect on our efforts to defeat the Vietcong and promises to become even more of a problem in the future unless drastic action is soon taken. The problem of which I speak is the aid that the Vietcong receives from Cambodia and from free world trade entering Cambodia by the means of the Mekong River through South Vietnam. This is the Vietcong's "backdoor" source of supply. It must be closed if we are to avoid a much longer war in South Vietnam just as surely as the "front door" of the North Vietnamese supply routes, and especially the

May 4, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9375

ficulties in acquiring this information, more effort and not less should be going forward.

I know of no reduced requirements for a "comprehensive, aggressive and continuing" underground nuclear weapons test program that the safeguards demand and that two Presidents have promised to support. In fact, if one considers the large underground nuclear weapons explosions that the Soviets have carried out and the needs to improve the assumed deliverability of our strategic deterrent weapons and the needs to decrease that characteristic of Soviet ICBM's, the needs for underground testing appear greater and not less.

So sufficient was the concern of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy over this safeguard that it took the unusual initiative of boosting by \$10 million the authorization for this purpose asked by the administration for fiscal year 1967. I believe the boost would have been greater if the JCAE had believed a turnaround of the program's decline could be accomplished more rapidly. If this increase is appropriated, it will be of considerable interest to see whether or not the administration allows the AEC to spend it.

MAINTENANCE OF WEAPONS LABORATORIES

The second safeguard, maintenance of our weapons laboratories, also has stagnated insofar as funding is concerned. AEC and DOD funding for weapons research and development at the three weapons laboratories—Los Alamos, Livermore, and Sandia—jumped more than 10 percent from fiscal year 1963 to fiscal year 1964 and close to 6 percent from fiscal year 1964 to fiscal year 1965. Since then the trend in both money and effort has been downward. Fiscal year 1967's decline of 12.4 percent less than fiscal year 1965 is the measure of U.S. slackening in effort to insure the continued application of our human resources to the weapons program.

There is, I believe, a very serious cause for concern that a continuation of this attenuation of our weapons laboratory output, as both AEC and DOD budgets contemplate, within a very short time it will lead to a total paralysis of developments in U.S. weapons technology.

Yet, modern nuclear weapons are essential to our strategic deterrent and to our capability to limit damage from surprise attack. Without research and development of a high caliber in nuclear weapons technology, including comprehensive and aggressive underground testing, we will not be able to maintain a modern weapons arsenal. Soviet developments, production and deployment of hardened silo ICBM's and of an anti-ballistic missile systems can swiftly negate an unimproved U.S. nuclear weapons arsenal.

Furthermore, should the need arise to deploy an extensive U.S. A-ICBM defense system, that need will be concurrent with a crisis and require great speed in implementation. An A-ICBM system necessarily must be designed around the warhead or warheads available to tip its missile destroying rockets. Safe, sound and sane planning dictates a major effort to design and perfect such

warheads and have them available well in advance of need. This work simply cannot be accomplished in stagnant or declining laboratories.

ATMOSPHERIC TEST READINESS

To achieve a readiness to resume atmospheric testing in the event our national security requires it, should the Soviet abrogate the treaty, or should actions of Red China or others compel it, the DOD and AEC together spent \$162.2 million in fiscal year 1964. This fell off to \$131.2 million in fiscal year 1965. The understandable reason given for this decreased funding is that the cost of building up to achievement of a readiness is greater than the cost of maintaining it. What is not so understandable, however, is why the cost of maintenance in fiscal year 1967, \$58.1 million, is lower by \$18.3 million from the cost of maintenance in fiscal year 1966, \$76.4 million. The year's decline in effort, when cost escalation is considered, is roughly one-third. It is very doubtful that very heavy capital expenditures for the buildup were incurred in fiscal year 1966. The buildup must have been substantially completed during the previous year. Therefore, the decline in actual effort for the maintenance of this capability scheduled for fiscal year 1967 is a very real and substantial one.

Yet, any abrogation of the treaty by the Soviets or other cause for atmospheric test resumption can only be foreseen under circumstances of critical international tension and crisis. These are the very conditions of expectation which the atmospheric testing safeguard capability should be designed to meet. If we are to maintain a capability at all, it must be for undelayed response with meaningful weapons tests that will demonstrate our readiness not only to test and progress—but also will show that our weapons for offense and defense are, indeed, most modern.

MONITORING SINO-SOVIET TESTS

The dollar funding for the monitoring of Sino-Soviet nuclear capabilities has gone up slightly each year since fiscal year 1964. As a consequence, the level of effort involved has more or less remained stable for this safeguard as contrasted to the others. This circumstance is explained less by an administration desire to maintain properly this safeguard than it is explained by the administration's zest for a relatively reliable underground test detecting system as a prelude to negotiating a total test ban treaty.

The information we acquire from Soviet underground tests about their weapons progress is very limited in comparison to the information from their atmospheric tests that gave us physical samples of test debris for analysis. The needs for such information are greater today, but irrespective of how much is spent on underground monitoring, the means for acquiring it are less.

CONCLUSION

In summary, I believe that the implementation of the safeguards, which started haltingly in fiscal year 1964, and, at best, were continued for a few years

statically, are now showing signs of a faltering future. The trend of our effort incontrovertibly is downward. New blood and greater efforts must be infused into the safeguards programs. Stagnant or reduced funding will not accomplish that. Annual increases of 5 percent in dollar funding are needed just to keep regularly escalating costs from shrinking the magnitude of the safeguards effort.

Furthermore, the administration must reexamine its test ban safeguards effort in the light of Soviet developments in offensive and defensive nuclear weapons. It can be predicted with confidence that such a reexamination can only show cause for greater efforts, much greater efforts, than are now apparent to overcome Soviet improvements and progress.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I commend our colleague for bringing this matter to the attention of the House and revealing the facts which hitherto have not been available to the membership. I regret that every Member of the House has not been present to hear his very timely remarks.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the gentleman. I know his constant concern for the defense of our Nation.

I say to the gentleman, not only the Members of this House should know and understand this information, but I believe the entire American public should be informed. It is a matter of deep concern to their individual health and safety and to the future of our country.

I have tried an experiment with my remarks today. I prepared them well in advance. I gave copies to several newspapers, including the New York Times, the Washington Post, and the Washington Star. I did this by way of an experiment, because those particular news media in 1963, at the time the treaty was negotiated, day after day after day assured their readers that these safeguards would in fact protect the security of the United States, and day after day after day in their editorial and news columns they assured the people that the President would keep these safeguard promises, yet they have not had the kindness or the courtesy yet, though they have this information now, 3 years later—while these promises are not being kept, to inform their readers of these facts.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I certainly want to commend the gentleman, who has taken the well of the House and whose knowledge extends so far and whose research has probed so deeply and perceptively into the matter on which he is today addressing the House, a matter which so sorely needs to be brought to the attention of the public.

I am not at all sure that even though the Commander in Chief or the Secretary of Defense are acquitting themselves properly or are even convinced in their own minds, Mr. Speaker, about playing

May 4, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9377

port of Haiphong, must be shut. I regret that here again full information concerning free world shipping on the Mekong River to Cambodia as made available to me by the Department of Defense is classified "secret" and that I cannot properly divulge the particulars of this trade. It is, however, even more regrettable that we apparently have not been doing enough to find out more about this illicit traffic. This is a scandalous situation especially in light of the increasingly hostile attitude of the Cambodian Government toward both South Vietnam and the United States. I am certain that if the American people were fully informed about this situation they would demand quick corrective action.

In my hand I have a secret document which purports to tell the details of this trade including the name and other pertinent information with respect to every ship that traversed the Mekong to Cambodia during 1965. It, however, discloses nearly as many gaps in our knowledge as it does hard information.

According to the Department of Defense:

During the first 3 months of 1966, 102 free world ships sailed up the Mekong through South Vietnam *** with Vietnamese pilots on board to show the way *** to the Cambodian port of Phnompenh. This figure represents about the same level of traffic as existed during the same period in 1965. For the whole year that amounts to over 400 ships up the Mekong.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert a chart indicating the registry of free world ships arriving at Phnompenh during 1966.

Free world ship arrivals in Cambodia at Phnompenh

[First quarter 1966]

Ship registry:	
France	18
Greece	1
Japan	18
Italy	1
Netherlands	3
Norway	3
Panama	48
United Kingdom	10
Total	102

The simple truth is that with more than a ship a day sailing right through South Vietnam up the Mekong River to Cambodia there exists no effective control over this trade to prevent the flow of contraband. The persistent reports of smuggled weapons and supplies which I have seen and heard leaves no doubt in my mind that the Vietcong ultimately derives substantial benefit from this traffic, whether in strategic or nonstrategic goods. I am shocked by the failure to take effective action to stop the flow of these illicit goods along this broad boulevard of traffic in a part of the world with little other transportation facilities.

For an idea as to just how this trade aids the Vietcong we need only read part of a dispatch written by Robert R. Brunn, for the Christian Science Monitor on September 2, 1964.

Diplomatic sources outline the possible route of the Peking supplies that get to Phnompenh in Cambodia in this way:

"European freighters that regularly unload in Communist China at such ports as Shang-

hai and Canton then take on crated weapons and material for delivery at Phnompenh.

"These freighters are not necessarily from Communist Eastern Europe. This China-to-Cambodia route is part of the international trade pattern, and the ships could well be British, French, and Japanese as well as Polish or Czech.

BULKY SHIPMENTS

"Shipments of this kind are so bulky that they must be handled by legitimate brokers in Phnompenh, usually French or Chinese Communists.

"Established for many years, these brokers also import to their warehouses such heavy equipment as sewing machines, appliances, farm pumps, and tractors.

"Western intelligence has traced these Chinese Communist shipments into the Phnompenh warehouses but never sees them move into the usual business channels.

"They just fade away," as one observer puts it.

"The assumption is that these shipments fade into the rather vague Communist channels in Phnompenh where they are broken up and sent down the Mekong River across the border into South Vietnam's delta, where the Vietcong controls large regions."

Since that time there has been no reason for concern to lessen over the Mekong River traffic. I have personally seen reports based on studies of numerous data, such as prisoner of war interrogations, which clearly testify to the existence of the aid and comfort the Vietcong receives from this source.

Just a few days ago on a special sub-committee assignment to South Vietnam for the House Armed Services Committee I was in Vung Tau, a coastal port at the mouth of the Saigon River, which also controls the passage of these vessels that are transversing the Mekong to Cambodia. One of the reasons I journeyed halfway around the world during the Easter recess was to go to this port for the specific purpose of discussing this problem with proper officials having first-hand knowledge of this Mekong shipping. I wanted to talk with our advisers who are working with the Vietnamese customs officials in order to get many answers to questions about this trade. I even asked to spend an extra day in this area in order that I could be more fully informed with respect to the overall problem. I regret to report to my colleagues that our military people recommended that I not do this because what further information could be had would be meaningless. I was told by a high-ranking naval officer:

Let me be brutally frank, we have no effective control.

It was made very clear to me that further probing in this area would only cause embarrassment.

Mr. Speaker, unless we face up to the ineffectiveness of our present efforts to check this source of supply for the enemy we can only expect a costlier, bloodier, longer war in Vietnam. There is far too much evidence indicating an unwillingness to take effective action. Undoubtedly in any demanding situation there are always an inexhaustible supply of excuses for not taking action, if one devotes himself to finding them. This can even lead to pretending that the problem does not really exist. For example, in a letter dated January 21, 1966,

I was informed by the Department of State that:

There cannot, of course, be complete certainty that no strategic goods or arms have moved up the Mekong, but it is a situation that is watched very closely. The Government of South Vietnam carefully regulates river traffic under security procedures consistent with rights of navigation on this international waterway. Vessels are turned back, if they carry questionable cargoes or if they refuse to permit cargo inspection by South Vietnamese officials.

The refusal of this statement to face the reality of the situation is incredible in view of this country's large and increasing commitments of men and materiel in the struggle in South Vietnam. This attitude is unfortunately all too familiar. It suggests the same "do not rock the boat" approach that was used to justify the failure to take more resolute action to stop free world trade with North Vietnam. The time is long overdue to start "rocking the boats" using the Mekong River that help supply the Vietcong.

THE QUESTION OF CAMBODIAN "NEUTRALITY"

Just what is the nature and extent of the aid and comfort being afforded the Vietcong from Cambodian soil?

There is no doubt in the minds of military leaders in South Vietnam of the use of Cambodian territory as a sanctuary and as a logistical base of support for North Vietnamese and Vietcong units. If any of my colleagues have any questions as to the evidence of Cambodian aid and comfort to our enemy I would simply recommend that they talk to any of our military people close to the situation there.

The supplies reaching the Vietcong are either of Cambodian origin or arrive through the Ho Chi Minh trail complex from the north, the port of Phnompenh via the Mekong River, or the port of Sihanoukville on the Gulf of Siam. However, the aid is taking other forms as well, for instance, while I was in Tay Ninh just a few days ago, a briefing officer referred to a chart on the wall and pointed out three different areas where airfields were located just a few miles across the border in Cambodia which were being used daily for air flights from North Vietnam to bring supplies for the Vietcong. We were also advised of another location within the general area that was being used as a training ground for the Vietcong. At that time, I specifically asked the officer if this information was classified and was advised that it was not, so I here and now make this information available to my colleagues and the American people. This raises the question "If the Cambodians are willing to permit the use of their sovereign soil by the enemies of Vietnam why should the Vietnamese, and why should we, who are making the tremendous effort that we are in support of the Vietnamese, tolerate the use of the Mekong River by a single ship that could even conceivably be bringing supplies of any nature to Cambodia and thence to the Vietcong, whether it be food, clothing, or materials of war?"

The Vietcong can obtain supplies in many ways. First of all, it is not difficult

9378

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

May 4, 1966

apparently for them to simply go into Cambodian marketplaces and buy food and medicine. For more clandestine items the so-called traditional smuggling channels operating across the ill-defined Cambodian-South Vietnamese border can be relied upon. Reportedly, the Vietcong are not hampered by a lack of funds.

The tolerance of this traffic strongly suggests either the inability or lack of desire to take effective action by the Cambodian Government, regardless of its alleged foreign policy of "strict neutrality." In fact, recent statements of the Cambodian Chief of State, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, clearly reveal his increasingly open support of the Vietcong, reportedly on the grounds that he believes that they will win in South Vietnam. Barely a month ago Sihanouk said:

The Vietcong *** asked us to provide them with some rice. We have given this aid to them by closing our eyes, because we and the Vietcong have a common enemy which is U.S. imperialism. It is in this way we have aided them.

We are left to wonder in how many other ways Cambodia has aided the Vietcong simply by "closing its eyes."

We know as well that Cambodian "neutrality" is being further compromised by the increasing dependency of its military forces upon Chinese and Soviet aid. In the same speech, delivered on March 24, 1966, at the Cambodian city of Kratie, Sihanouk stated:

In recent days, China sent ships carrying arms of all calibers and kinds and a large quantity of ammunition, and these ships have already arrived in our port of Sihanouville. China will continue to send us arms and ammunition needed by our country. In other words, we have only to ask for aid and we will receive it, for our faithful friend on the other side has agreed to give us plenty.

A new agreement with the Soviet Union will bring in military aid valued at about \$2.4 million including five fully armed Mig-17's and an antiaircraft battery for the purpose of "resisting Thai aggression," according to Prince Sihanouk.

The fiction of Cambodian neutrality is more and more recognized. In a column appearing in the New York Times of May 1, 1966, C. L. Sulzberger, in reporting that Cambodia now sends 30,000 tons of rice annually to the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese troops, said:

I have reversed my previous impression and concluded that Cambodia is indeed a sanctuary and supply source for the Vietcong on such a scale that the Phnom Penh Government must know it. From the extreme south to Laos in the north, Cambodia is violating its proclaimed neutrality.

I was wrong in what I wrote a fortnight ago from Phnompenh and Western diplomats and military attaches there are being fooled. Cambodia isn't acting in the least bit neutral, no matter what it pretends.

THE MEKONG CONVENTION OF 1954 AND SOUTH VIETNAMESE SECURITY

Since January 1, 1955, the Mekong River has been an international waterway subject to the rights of navigation agreed to by Cambodia, Laos, and South Vietnam at Paris on December 29, 1954.

In the protocol annexed to this convention, agreed to on the same day, it was stated in article II:

Navigation of the whole course of the Mekong, its navigable tributaries, issues and mouth, must conform to the measures prescribed by the river states, notably matters of sanitation, policy, and customs and for the maintenance of general security.

In late October of 1964, the South Vietnamese Government in order to insure "the maintenance of general security" within its country felt it necessary to take unilateral action to close the Mekong River to Communist flag ships, and to free world ships coming from Communist ports or which were known to carry goods of Communist origin to reduce the possibility of war materials being diverted to the Vietcong either along the waterway itself or through Cambodia. The gravity of this action reflects the changed conditions under which the convention of 1954 now exists since it signifies that in the absence of unilateral action by South Vietnam, the convention would constitute a threat to the security of that country.

Unfortunately, as necessary as the restrictions on Communist trade were they have proved ineffective. In the first place, it is still possible for Communist goods to travel up the Mekong in free world ships under charter to Communist countries. Secondly, there exists no effective program of surveillance of cargoes of free world ships, despite persistent reports that weapons still reach the Vietcong from this source. Furthermore, while all ships traversing the Mekong are required to have a Vietnamese pilot and customs official aboard there has been to date no effective inspection to determine whether the ships' manifests accurately represent the cargo on board.

In view of these facts what courses of action remain open? Complete inspection of each vessel in view of the time and facilities it would require does not appear feasible. Selective inspection would not adequately eliminate the possibility of contraband.

The only successful way to stop this illicit traffic reaching the Vietcong is simply to close the river to all ocean traffic bound for Cambodia. In other words I believe that the South Vietnamese Government should be encouraged in the interests of "the maintenance of general security" to abrogate the convention of 1954.

At the Geneva Conference in 1954 Cambodia demanded the internationalization of the Mekong River with its control to be placed in the hands of an interstate commission. In the convention signed at Paris provision was made for such a commission but it has never become operable. Consequently, regulation of the river has been left to unilateral action which in effect means that South Vietnam, by virtue of its geographical position, retains in fact control of the river. In 1956, for instance, the Saigon Government closed the river for several months to Cambodian traffic until Phnompenh agreed to establish diplomatic relations, which until that time it had refused to do, on the grounds of its alleged policy of "strict neutrality." That policy, as I have already indicated, has now apparently been replaced by one of open political

and economic assistance to the enemies of South Vietnam. Just last week on April 24, Prince Sihanouk at a ceremony at the royal palace at Phnompenh in which he personally delivered 7 tons of food to a Vietcong delegation, announced that in the near future Cambodia and North Vietnam and the Vietcong would sign agreements setting forth "definite bases for peaceful coexistence between our two countries which have at all times been side by side in fraternity and in respect for our sovereignty and our territorial integrity." Sihanouk added:

Allow me to thank you for the correct and respectful attitude of our brothers of the National Liberation Front toward our neutrality and our territorial integrity.

Obviously the conditions which existed between Cambodia and South Vietnam when the convention was signed have decisively changed.

It is, I am told, a recognized principle of international law that a treaty becomes voidable according to the doctrine of rebus sic stantibus as soon as it is dangerous to the life and incompatible with the independence of a state provided that its injurious effects were not intended by the two contracting parties at the time of its conclusion.

Closing the Mekong will not, of course, eliminate all forms of aid and comfort reaching the Vietcong through Cambodia. Some of the trade up the Mekong could be expected to be diverted to the ocean port of Sihanouville. Nevertheless, the strain put upon docking facilities would hopefully put a high premium on all cargo space so that only goods that Cambodia itself required would be imported.

The purpose of the action I recommend is to limit not expand the war by reducing Cambodia's participation through available economic rather than military means. The growing commitment of American men and material in South Vietnam demands that a business-as-usual attitude toward Mekong River traffic can no longer be tolerated. The Vietnamese people are locked in a life and death struggle for their very existence. Over 40,000 Vietnamese have been killed in action defending their country. Yes, and more than 3,100 American boys have lost their lives trying to insure the independence of this country, which the parties signing the Geneva accords of 1954 had proclaimed and agreed to respect. With casualties like this, the time has long since passed when the Vietnamese or when our Government should sit back and insist upon the international niceties and the observance of a treaty that subverts the efforts being made to protect Vietnam's very existence.

It is fundamental that supplies are essential for the success of any military operation. So long as the supply lines to the enemy are open, the success of our efforts to assist the Vietnamese remains questionable. Although the port of Haiphong is still open for both free world and Communist ships supplying North Vietnam, the administration finally conceded that something should be done to reduce the flow of goods to Hanoi which

May 4, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9379

benefit the Vietcong and just a few weeks ago belatedly decided to "blacklist" ships sailing to North Vietnam. Something should be and must be done now to stop shipping up the Mekong.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the Mekong River Convention of 1954, a copy of the memorandum issued by the Prime Minister of South Vietnam on October 26, 1964, closing the Mekong River to Communist trade, and a copy of the New York Times column by C. L. Sulzberger entitled "Foreign Affairs: Neutral Is as Neutral Does" be inserted in that order at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONVENTION RELATIVE TO REGULATION OF MARITIME AND RIVER NAVIGATION ON THE MEKONG AND OF RIVER NAVIGATION OF THE APPROACHES TO THE PORT OF SAIGON

His Majesty the King of Cambodia, His Majesty the King of Laos, His Majesty the Chief of State of Vietnam, considering the particular geographic configuration of the Mekong in Indochina which makes this river a way of common interest to the three states,

Desirous, within the framework of their friendly relations, of maintaining and consolidating cooperation between their countries, whose economies are interdependent.

Convinced that free navigation on the navigable course of the Mekong is of a nature to develop these economies as well as cooperation of the three states among themselves, conforming to the ends and principles of the charter of the United Nations.

Have resolved to conclude the present convention.

They have called for this purpose as their plenipotentiaries:

His Majesty the King of Cambodia: His Excellency Au Chheun, Minister of State.

His Majesty the King of Laos: His Excellency Leuang Inssienmay, Minister of Finances.

His Majesty, the Chief of State of Vietnam: Mr. Nguyen Van Thoai, Minister of Planning and Reconstruction.

These, after having exchanged their full powers, recognized in good and due form, have agreed to the provisions which follows:

ARTICLE I

On the basis of equality of treatment, navigation is free upon all of the course of the Mekong, its navigable tributaries, issues and mouths, situated upon the territory of Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam as well as upon all the waterways giving access to the port of Saigon and to the sea.

Regarding the laws and customs regulations of each river state, navigation between Phnom Penh and the sea by the Mekong and the waterways described in the present paragraph is considered maritime navigation.

ARTICLE II

This freedom of navigation is granted freely to States having recognized diplomatically the High Contracting Parties. It becomes effective following the adherence of each State to the protocol annexed to the present convention fixing the conditions of navigation.

Concerning States not having recognized diplomatically the High Contracting Parties, freedom of navigation is subject to the agreement of these High Parties.

ARTICLE III

Each of the High Contracting Parties undertakes to the two others, for one part, to abstain from all measures susceptible of directly or indirectly hindering navigation or rendering it more difficult in lasting fashion and, for the other part, to take as rapidly as possible all desirable arrangements for

the purpose of chartering all obstacles and dangers to navigation.

If this navigation requires regular upkeep, each of these High Parties have, to that end, the obligation toward to the other two other to take measures and to execute the necessary works upon its territory as rapidly as possible.

If it is established that some expenses falling to one of these High Parties exceed considerably those required by the needs of its own traffic, it may request of the two others equitable participation in these expenses.

ARTICLE IV

Provided that they satisfy the provisions of the preceding articles, the High Contracting Parties reserve to themselves the right to use upon their respective territory the waters of the Mekong, its tributaries and issues, for industrial and agricultural purposes.

Except for legitimate opposition by one of the High Parties and especially the State territorially concerned, based either upon the conditions of navigability themselves, or upon other vital interests, a river State may not refuse to execute, upon the command of one of the other two High Parties, works necessary to the improvement of navigability, if that or those High Parties offer to pay their whole cost as well as subsequently an equitable part of the increase of the cost of upkeep. The works may not be undertaken while the State on whose territory they will be executed continues its legitimate opposition.

The State charged with executing the work of upkeep may free itself of that obligation by entrusting it to one or to the two other high parties. For works of improvement, the State charged with execution will be free of this obligation if it authorizes the high party or parties requesting them to execute them in its place. The execution of the works by States other than the State territorially concerned will be carried out without prejudice to the latter, of its rights of control over the execution of the works and the prerogatives of its sovereignty over the navigable way. The State territorially concerned undertakes, on its part, to assist the executing State with all its power under all circumstances.

ARTICLE V

In the spirit of the present convention and in order to facilitate its application, the high contracting parties agree to coordinate their action upon the following questions:

Rules of navigation and police to be established by each of the high parties over the navigable way bearing its sovereignty;

Programs and projects of improvement of the waterways, their works and equipment;

Work projects of industrial, agricultural or other interest to the extent that they are susceptible of creating serious and lasting difficulties to navigation;

Apportionment of the costs of upkeep and new works between the high contracting parties;

Questions relative to duties, taxes and assessments of all nature levied by each of the high contracting parties arising from navigation upon the waterways defined in the first article;

All other questions whose common interest shall have been recognized.

ARTICLE VI

A Commission is created called the Mekong Commission comprising representatives of the high contracting parties. This Commission is charged with supervision of the execution of the provisions of the present convention and in assuring the coordination aimed at in the preceding article, notably:

1. Elaborating rules of navigation;

2. Advising the river States of desirable works;

3. Receiving communications of the States on all improvement projects set up by them;

4. Proposing the regulation of tolls and their collection.

This Commission is empowered to receive requests, petitions and recommendations of juristic persons of all nationalities, including the representatives of foreign flags, using the waterways made the object of the present convention, or, upon the request of one of the States of Cambodia, Laos or Vietnam, to conduct a hearing of the same persons.

It addresses its studies and recommendations to the Government concerned.

This commission includes a Secretariat whose seat is at Phnompenh. It will hold its first session in January 1955 and will establish then the roles of its organization and operation.

ARTICLE VII

In case, in the application of the present convention, there should arise litigious questions between the High Contracting Parties which could not be resolved by amicable agreement and by diplomatic means they will submit the dispute to agencies will be provided in an accord on conciliation and arbitration to be drawn up within 3 months from the signature of the present convention.

ARTICLE VIII

The present convention will be ratified.

Instruments of ratification will be exchanged between the Government of the High Contracting Parties.

ARTICLE IX

The present convention will enter into force as of January 1, 1953.

Done at Paris, in three copies, December 29, 1954.

For Cambodia:

His Excellency AU CHHEUN.

For Laos:

His Excellency LEUAM INSSIENMAY.

For Vietnam:

His Excellency MR. NGUYEN VAN THOAI.

Interpretative Note

Article 1—Paragraph 2: To avoid any irregular debarkation on Vietnamese territory during passage of vessels between the mouths of the Mekong and the Cambodian frontier, agents of the Vietnamese customs will escort the said vessels between these mouths and the Cambodian frontier.

Interpretative note to articles I and II: The provisions of articles 1 and 2 of this Convention form no barrier to the Navigation of Thai vessels on the portion of the Mekong situated on the territory of Laos in accordance with the France-Siamese Convention of August 25, 1926.

PROTOCOL ANNEXED TO THE CONVENTION OF THE REGULATION OF MARITIME AND RIVER NAVIGATION UPON THE MEKONG AND OF RIVER NAVIGATION OF THE APPROACHES TO THE PORT OF SAIGON

The Governments of the Kingdom of Cambodia, the Kingdom of Laos and the State of Vietnam,

Have agreed to that which follows:

ARTICLES I

In order to benefit effectively from freedom of navigation on the whole course of the Mekong, its navigable tributaries, issues, and mouths,

It is requested of the States having recognized diplomatically the States of Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam, and of the States not yet having recognized diplomatically the States of Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam, but in whose favor these last have decided, of one common accord, to recognize that freedom of navigation.

That they declare by means of exchange of letters with the States of Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam, their desire to adhere to the conditions of navigation prescribed by the present protocol.

ARTICLE II

Navigation of the whole course of the Mekong, its navigable tributaries, issues, and

9380

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

May 4, 1966

mouts, must conform to the measures prescribed by the river states, notably in matters of sanitation, police, and customs and for the maintenance of general security.

ARTICLE III

Each river State has the right to subject the transportation of persons and merchandise to certain conditions, provided that these conditions fully respect the provisions relative to equality of treatment.

ARTICLE IV

Freedom of navigation will not be hindered by the laws and national regulations of the river States concerning the import and export of merchandise as well as immigration and emigration.

ARTICLE V

Navigation will be subject, on the basis of equality of treatment to the payment of duties, taxes, assessments and tolls due according to the territorial legislation in force.

ARTICLE VI

The provisions of Articles 2, 3, 4 and 5 are applied without prejudice to those of paragraph 2 of the first article of the convention relative to the regulation of navigation upon the Mekong.

ARTICLE VII

Coastal trade from one port to another situated upon the course of the Mekong, its navigable tributaries, issues and mouts is reserved to the national flags of Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam.

These States reserve to themselves, however, each in that which concerns itself, the right to authorize this trade in favor of the flags of States benefiting from the freedom of navigation upon the Mekong.

Done at Paris in three copies, December 29, 1954, to be annexed to the convention relative to the regulation of maritime and river navigation upon the Mekong and of river navigation of the approaches to the Port of Saigon.

For Cambodia:

His Excellency AU CHHEUN.

For Laos:

His Excellency LEUAM INSISSIENMAY.

For Vietnam:

Mr. NGUYEN VAN THOAI.

[A MEMORANDUM]

REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM, PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE—NO. 845-FTP/VP/K, MAT.

Saigon, October 26, 1964.

Subject: Foreign ships or boats transiting the Mekong River in the waters of the Republic of Vietnam.

In order to maintain national security and to control traffic on the Mekong River from the date of issue of this note, the following measures recommended by the Inter-Department Council will be applied until a new order is issued:

1. Foreign ships or boats transiting the Mekong River in the waters of the Republic of Vietnam must request authorization in advance; warships must request through diplomatic channels; commercial boats must request at the local customs service (Tan Chan and Vung Tau). Commercial boats which have recently stopped in a Communist country, or have the flag of the country not recognizing the Republic of Vietnam (annex I, list of nations recognizing the Republic of Vietnam) or carry weapons, ammo or merchandise that can be used for military purposes are not authorized to transit. However, commercial boats carrying ammo or merchandise that could be used for military purposes (annex II, list of merchandise with military characteristics) can request authorization in advance from the Vietnam Department of Defense through diplomatic channels. That list can be changed according to the decision of the Department of Defense or Interior Department.

2. Commercial boats which are authorized to transit must have a Vietnamese pilot to

guide and must be escorted the entire route. Commercial boats must contact local customs service to receive the escort. The escort team will include customs personnel, security police, or servicemen.

The meals for escort teams will be provided by the boat.

Vietnamese pilots will guide it on the Mekong River. The pilot also can guide from Phuom Penh. The Royal Cambodian Government can request monthly in advance from Vietnam public works through diplomatic channels.

3. In suspect cases, qualified Vietnam authorities can control the merchandise, sanitation, customs papers, also the merchandise storages or bring the commercial boat to Saigon commercial port to process as above.

4. Boats are only authorized to navigate in daytime, from sunrise until sunset.

5. At night or waiting for high tide the boats can only anchor at the following places:

My Tho (between KM 54-55 Cu Lao Rong Isle side).

Bal My Thuan (KM 109).

Cao Lanh (KM 147-148).

Tau Chan (KM 219-220).

Department of Foreign Affairs, Department of Defense, Department of Interior, Department of Public Works, Department of Finance, Department of Health are to implement respectively this note.

P. M. KHANH.

Addressee: Secretary of Defense.

[From the New York Times, May 1, 1966]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: NEUTRAL IS AS NEUTRAL DOES

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

DAK PEK, KONTUM PROVINCE, SOUTH VIETNAM.—The first guerrilla "war of liberation" following World War II was the Greek Communist insurrection. This was put down by Greece's national army with extensive American help and a U.S. mission of military "advisers" under Gen. James Van Fleet.

The Communists received massive aid through Bulgaria, Yugoslavia (which hadn't yet broken with Moscow) and Albania. Furthermore, the guerrillas used frontier regions of Albania as a sanctuary and supply base. The uprising was crushed only after Tito split with the Cominform, closed Yugoslavia's borders, isolated Albania and cut off the insurgents.

South Vietnam's "war of liberation" is similar to that of Greece although on a far, far larger scale. But one problem is identical—a gaping, open flank. In this case Laos plays the Yugoslav role, funneling arms and men from North Vietnam to the South, and Cambodia assumes the Albanian role as sanctuary and base.

IS CAMBODIA NEUTRAL?

Recently I was persuaded in Phnom Penh that Cambodia was trying to be truly neutral in the Vietnamese conflict. I wrote: "Those who are paid to know such things insist Cambodia is not willingly allowing the Vietcong to use this country's territory as a sanctuary or supply route and that any violations are of relatively minor importance."

I was wrong. I have satisfied myself of this on a trip by plane and helicopter along the Cambodian border right up to its juncture with Laos. I visited military positions and remote U.S. Special Forces outposts at Song Be, Due Co, Dak To, and Dak Pek, in areas inhabited by the following Montagnard tribes: Jarai, Bahnar, Jeh, Sedang, and Hleng. I heard American, South Vietnamese, and Montagnard accounts of what was happening inside Cambodia, a few miles away.

SOURCE AND SANCTUARY

On the basis of this investigation I have reversed my previous impression and concluded that Cambodia is indeed a sanctuary and supply source for the Vietcong on such a scale that the Phnompenh government must know it. From the extreme south to

Laos in the north, Cambodia is violating its proclaimed neutrality.

Chief of State Prince Sihanouk broadcast on March 22 that the Vietcong could send their wounded to Cambodian hospitals and when they recovered they would be returned to the battlefield. On March 23 he announced he was furnishing the Vietcong with rice and "we have given this aid to them by closing our eyes because we and the Vietcong have a common enemy, which is U.S. imperialism." Although these statements were omitted from official Phnompenh versions, Sihanouk's speeches were monitored.

The Vietcong's 263 Transportation Escort Groups handles wounded, weapons, and munitions in south Cambodia. Cambodian 25 pounders, artillery not possessed by the Vietcong, fired at the Cai Cai Special Forces camp on April 3, killing one U.S. officer. An impressive buildup of Vietcong and North Vietnamese troops is underway on the Cambodian side of the Chu Pong Mountain massif.

There appear to be three North Vietnamese regiments inside Cambodia around Chu Pong and seven others across the border in Pleiku Province, supplied from Cambodia. This represents at least 25,000 men who came southward through Laos and Cambodia to avoid U.S. aerial attacks. Although, the frontier is heavily forested, 14 well-traveled crossing trails have been marked near Chu Pong.

SIHANOUK ROAD

A Cambodian supply route called the Sihanouk Road by Americans has been developed from Siem Pang northward to Laos where it swings eastward and southward toward Chu Pong along a jeep trail. In the vicinity of present North Vietnamese concentrations are scattered elements of the 26th, 28th and 27th Cambodian battalions which would scarcely fail to observe the foreigners. Cambodia now sends 30,000 tons of rice annually to Vietcong and North Vietnamese troops. A staging area between Vietcong forces in War Zone C and the 4th Corps region exists in east Cambodian Svay Rieng. Fleeing Vietcong units take refuge in Cambodia.

BASE OF OPERATIONS

Like Greece's Communists, who maintained headquarters in Epirus on the Albanian frontier, the Vietcong has its principal headquarters about 8 miles from Cambodia where COSVN (Control Office for South Vietnam) is established. COSVN directs the puppet National Liberation Front located nearby. The details are numberless. Near Duc Co an American Special Forces captain was recently killed and his body dragged to Cambodia. At Dak To the intelligence officer wryly comments: "The Vietcong is using Cambodia all over the place." At Dak Pek Montagnards report the southward passage of Communist troops along Cambodian trails.

I was wrong in what I wrote a fortnight ago from Phnompenh and Western diplomats and military attachés there are being fooled. Cambodia isn't acting in the least bit neutral, no matter what it pretends. In no sense do I advocate extending the nasty Indo-China war but I do advocate warning Sihanouk to cease his interference.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to join with the gentleman in the well, the distinguished member of the Committee on Armed Services from Michigan, who has now again served the Nation well in bringing forward this rocking boat on the Mekong River. Certainly we must

May 4, 1966.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9381

do something to rock the boat of the shipping that is going to the nonneutralist countries that are actually supporting our allies and those who are serving aggression in South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the report tonight to the effect that the so-called neutralist nations of the world have cut down shipping to the vital Hanoi-Haiphong supply area. I would hope that we would do more to interdict the logistical supplies, thus untying the hands of our over one-quarter million troops that we now have in South Vietnam fighting this aggression.

Mr. Speaker, we can be nothing but proud of our troops, their morale, their esprit de corps, and dedication to keep fighting against aggression. As has been said, Mr. Speaker, if we do not defend freedom in South Vietnam, where would we defend it?

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan has well pointed out and succinctly stated that we must close our supply lines within our capability regardless of international niceties. It is time that we treaded softly but carried a big stick in eliminating those who would supply the enemy of freedom with the materials of war, to shoot down our own loved ones overseas.

Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from Michigan for what the gentleman has done. I feel he has rendered a great service to the Nation, far beyond those who cast doubt as to the pride we might well have in our Armed Forces in their assigned mission by our Commander in Chief in defending the liberty of these people in southeast Asia.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we know, as members of the Committee on Armed Services, that in the defense of South Vietnam hangs the keystone in the strategy of the defense of all southeast Asia. And, if that is to be defended, then we must not dictate from the Pentagon or elsewhere how the war is to be fought, but we must loose the hands of the men who have had to act with restraint and who have had their hands tied behind them so that we can clean this up at the earliest possible date according to military dictates with the least possible loss of life and hold them from harm and bring them home.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the generous comments of my distinguished colleague and assure him that I welcome his support in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that it is beyond my comprehension that this problem is complex to some people. Supply is basic. If there is a struggle of any kind, I do not care if you are fighting with bows and arrows and you run out of arrows you are in trouble. If you are using slingshots and you have not any stones for it, you are in trouble. If you are fighting with snowballs and do not have any snowballs, you are in trouble.

Mr. Speaker, the same is true with reference to atomic bombs, and the same is true with reference to the use of conventional weapons. The same is true in this instance. If the enemy is denied supplies, it is going to shorten the conflict.

Mr. Speaker, we must support the over one-quarter million boys that we have overseas and provide them the logistics

and further to shut off every possible valve of supply to the enemy.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, PRESIDENT TRUMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KREBS). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege each year at this time since 1959, to join my colleagues here in wishing our beloved former President Harry S. Truman a happy birthday. Mr. Truman, the first citizen of my home city and our State, will be 82 years old on Sunday, May 8.

As President Lyndon B. Johnson has so aptly pointed out, however, Mr. Truman has indeed "succeeded in vetoing birthdays."

Harry S. Truman might well have been content at his mature time of life to sit back and reflect upon his remarkable accomplishments as 32d President of the United States. No man has ever been catapulted into this great but demanding office of the Presidency at a more crucial time in our country's history. Yet the man from Independence did not falter for a moment. With unsurpassed scepter of leadership and guided our Nation into the successful conclusion of moral courage, he took hold of the World War II.

Harry Truman was not afraid to make the momentous decisions which those trying times demanded of him.

Gen. Omar N. Bradley, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has observed:

No one has ever faced as many difficult decisions as President Truman. He made them all and he made them right.

Of his awesome decision to use the atom bombs to hasten the end of World War II, Mr. Truman commented on his television series last year in "Decision: The Conflicts of Harry S. Truman":

I never had any qualms about an instrument that finally ended the war in which we would have had 250,000 to 300,000 of our youngsters killed and 700,000 of them maimed.

It was Harry S. Truman's prompt response to the call for help from Greece and Turkey who were being threatened by Communist aggression, which resulted in the Truman doctrine of 1947 that saved those brave countries for the free world. Historians now classify as "two major milestones in U.S. foreign policy" the Monroe Doctrine of the 19th century and the Truman doctrine of the 20th century. The Monroe Doctrine assured the liberties of all peoples of the American continents, while the Truman doctrine assured the liberties of all peoples living in a free world.

Mr. Truman succeeded, furthermore, in bringing this country into the United Nations, thus fulfilling the cherished dreams of Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt for a worldwide organization upon which man's hope for global peace depends.

Chief Justice Earl Warren has called the U.N. "the most meaningful step that has ever been taken toward collective security in the history of man."

In 1950, it was Mr. Truman's unhesitating decision to send troops to Korea which prevented the spread of communism that could have engulfed that part of the world.

Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY recently noted:

President Johnson is seeking to accomplish in Vietnam what President Harry S. Truman achieved in his time—to make aggression unprofitable.

But Harry Truman did not seek only to aid free people who were being threatened by aggressors. He had the vision to implement such programs as the Marshall plan which brought much needed aid to the war-torn countries of Europe after World War II; and later the point 4 program of technical assistance to underdeveloped countries which was sorely needed.

President Johnson, in assessing how the ideals of the Truman policy to combat ignorance and hunger and disease among nations has carried through to our present time, said:

What would the world be like today if President Truman had not launched this program?

Recognizing how Mr. Truman has always been concerned about the welfare of his fellow man, President Johnson flew to Independence last July to sign into law the \$6.5 billion medicare bill in the presence of the man who "pioneered the concept of health care for the elderly"—our former President Harry S. Truman. Mr. Johnson stated:

We haven't forgotten who is the real daddy of medicare. And because of the fight that you started many years ago, 19 million Americans will be eligible to receive new hope and new security when the program begins * * *. And 19 million Americans have another reason, another cause to bless Harry S. Truman.

It is gratifying that Mr. Truman's place in history is acknowledged far beyond the members of his own political party. Clare Boothe Luce, that brilliant and often candid Republican leader, had this to say on the occasion of the presentation of a statue of Mr. Truman in Athens, Greece's Truman Square—on Mr. Truman's 81st birthday.

This [Truman] doctrine, proclaimed in 1947, and soon supplemented by the Marshall plan, certainly saved Greece, Turkey, Italy and France—perhaps all Europe—outside the Iron Curtain. And equally certain, Truman's decision to stand in Korea saved at least half that country—and probably the Philippines and Japan. The Berlin airlift rescued West Berlin from strangulation and absorption by the Communists. These were no mean deeds. Reflecting on them, one begins to ask why is not all of Europe studded with statues of Truman?

In recent years, Mr. Truman has devoted much of his time to the establishment of the Truman Library in his hometown of Independence, Mo. This fine building, which houses over 5 million documents from his administration, as well as other gifts and historical mementos, was built without cost to the Government from funds donated by thousands of people in all parts of the country. Dedicated on July 6, 1957, the library is administered by the National Archives and Records Service of the General Services Administration.

The former President has delighted in conducting students on tours through

9382

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

May 4, 1966

the building and in personally answering their questions.

The reason I like to talk to you—

He explained—

is because I want to impress upon you the fact that it is up to you to maintain the greatest Government in the history of the world—and that is the Government of the United States.

Mr. Truman has always had a great desire for the American public to understand more fully the powers, the duties, and the responsibilities of the Office of the Presidency of this country. "The President's job is really six jobs." In the library's museum of the Presidency is a striking exhibit which illustrates his role as Chief Executive; Chief of State; legislative planner and partner with Congress; head of his political party; Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces; and director of foreign policy.

In expressing his views of the Presidency in a national magazine—Look, November 11, 1958—Mr. Truman marveled at the genius of the framers of the Constitution in creating an office—the Presidency of the United States—which could function as well in this rocket and atoms age as it did in the age of the stagecoach, the sailing ship and the powdered wig.

He noted that most of the powers that a President exercises today are authorized by the Constitution, but that other powers have been built up by customs created by the times, and by events in emergencies met by our stronger Presidents.

An association of historians, national in scope, recently lauded Mr. Truman for his "capacity for decisions" and stated that he brought "new dimension" to the power of the Presidency in foreign affairs.

Early this year the Norwegian Nobel Institute confirmed that former President Truman has been nominated for the 1966 Nobel Peace Prize. The nominating letter stated that:

Few periods of modern history have been so crucial to the future of world peace as the postwar years (1945-53) when Harry Truman assumed the leadership of the West. Few men can match his record in promoting the brotherhood of man and the association of nations.

With characteristic directness, Mr. Truman once said:

There is no secret to our main commitment as a nation. It is to keep the peace. That is the heart and soul of our foreign policy.

In January, President Johnson went to Missouri to participate in the inaugural ceremonies of the Harry S. Truman Center for the Advancement of Peace. The center is to be located on the campus of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, and will be dedicated to the destruction of the causes of war. A Harry S. Truman award of \$50,000 will be given annually as part of the center's antiwar program.

On this occasion, President Truman was cited for his deep concern for and dedication to international peace and cooperation to which he, as President, made lasting contributions.

It was my pleasure to be present at that time, and to hear President John-

son speak one of his favorite quotations from Mr. Truman:

I have a deep and abiding faith in the destiny of freemen. With patience and courage we shall some day move on to a new era—a wonderful golden age—an age when we can use the peaceful tools that science has forged for us to do away with poverty and human misery everywhere on earth.

It is a high honor and a personal privilege to join with others the world over in wishing Harry S. Truman a very happy birthday. We already know how this world has been blessed by his presence here—as a loyal preserver of man's inherent right to be free, as a courageous and decisive President of our great Nation, and perhaps most endearing of all, as a man who never lost the personal touch of love and concern for his brother man.

IN THE NAME OF JUSTICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on July 28, 1965, in a press conference statement concerning Vietnam the President stated:

We do not seek the destruction of any government, nor do we covet a foot of any territory. But we insist, and we will always insist, that the people of South Vietnam shall have the right of choice, the right to shape their own destiny in free elections in the South, or throughout all Vietnam under international supervision. And they shall not have any government imposed upon them by force and terror so long as we can prevent it.

These are the fundamental principles, both forthright and just, upon which our defense of the valiant people of South Vietnam are based, and which have the support of an overwhelming majority of this Nation's citizens.

To implement this policy as far as possible, the President in the above-mentioned press conference said:

I have directed Ambassador Goldberg to go to New York today and to present immediately to Secretary General U Thant a letter from me requesting that all of the resources, energy, and immense prestige of the United Nations be employed to find ways to halt aggression and to bring peace in Vietnam.

This policy of free elections and the use of the services of the United Nations to achieve this end is precisely the position which is embodied in proposed legislation submitted to Congress over the last several years in behalf of the captive nations of Europe, Cuba, and mainland China. This proposal reads in part:

The President of the United States is further authorized and requested to instruct the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations to take steps to have placed on the agenda of the General Assembly at the next regular session * * * any measure or measures which would guarantee internationally supervised free elections by secret ballot in the captive nations, and to press for early approval of such measures.

How far has this proposed legislation progressed?

In the preceding Congress similar legislation was introduced by various Members of Congress but died in committee when the 88th Congress ended in 1964.

In 1965, I again introduced this proposal and at my request the House Committee on Foreign Affairs wrote to the State Department for a report. The request by the committee was made in late September 1965, and at this late date I am still waiting for an answer. Meanwhile, millions of human beings, deprived of their God-given rights by cruel and despotic governments, hope for the voices of the free world to plead their urgent cause before the world tribunal.

Not only has the United States by its silence before the world today forgotten the just cause of the captive peoples, but recent developments indicate that we intend to aid and abet their captors in a more positive way by more liberal trade policies with the Communist countries of Eastern Europe.

Yesterday the Washington Star carried a news item which stated that the President is instructing the Secretary of State to send Congress proposed legislation to promote expansion of trade between the United States and the Communist Eastern European nations. One of the reasons for this proposed drastic departure from long-established policy is to help build a Europe in which the people of every nation "know again the responsibilities and rewards of free political choices," to quote the President from the above-cited Star account.

If we are sincere in desiring that the captive peoples "know again the responsibilities and rewards of political choices," the United States must insist that the cause of the captive peoples and their right of self-determination be brought before the United Nations, and Ambassador Goldberg should be instructed by the President to take the steps necessary to have this issue placed on the agenda of the United Nations for full and exhaustive consideration. Then, two of the steps taken by the President, namely, insistence on free elections and utilization of the services of the United Nations on behalf of Vietnam, will at least focus world attention on the plight of the captive peoples and instill in them a measure of hope for a future freedom in peace and justice.

I insert the item from the Washington Star of May 3, 1966, entitled, "Johnson Orders Rusk To Push Red Trade Bill," in the RECORD at this point:

JOHNSON ORDERS RUSK TO PUSH RED TRADE BILL

(By Garnett D. Horner)

President Johnson said today that he is instructing Secretary of State Dean Rusk to send Congress proposed legislation to promote expansion of trade between the United States and Communist Eastern European nations.

The key feature of the proposal, officials said, would be to give Johnson the authority to extend to the Eastern European countries most-favored-nation tariff treatment—giving their exports to the United States tariffs as low as those given any country on similar products.

"The intimate engagement of peaceful trade over a period of time can influence Eastern European societies to develop along paths favorable to world peace," Johnson said.

Johnson announced the move in a speech in the White House rose garden as he signed a proclamation on the occasion of the 1,000th anniversary of Christianity in Poland.

He described the proposed action to expand East-West trade as one step in U.S. efforts

May 4, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9383

to encourage "every constructive enrichment of the human, cultural and commercial ties between Eastern Europe and the West."

The President said the United States wants to help build a Europe "free of artificial political barriers," secured by "internationally inspected arms control arrangements," and in which the people of every nation "know again the responsibilities and rewards of free political choices."

Describing the NATO alliance between the United States and Western European nations as a "charter for changing needs," Johnson emphasized that "an integrated Atlantic defense is the first necessity * * * of the building of unity in Western Europe—for expanding partnership across the Atlantic—and for reconciling differences with the East."

HAD EXPECTED MESSAGE

It had been generally expected that Johnson would submit the proposed legislation to Congress in a special message. His disclosure today that he was instructing Rusk to send the bill to Congress was the first clear indication that it would not go directly from the White House.

There have been reports that Democratic congressional leaders had sought to discourage the President from submitting the East-West trade proposals this year because of indications of opposition in Congress growing out of support of the Vietcong in the Vietnam war by Eastern European Communist nations. But Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat of Montana, the majority leader, said today that "as a matter of fact, we encouraged him" to submit the proposed legislation.

THE LATE DANIEL R. McIVER

(Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. VIVIAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I lost a long-time friend and the State of Rhode Island one of its most outstanding citizens in the death of Daniel R. McIver. Dan and I had worked together on a number of civic projects over the years but it is particularly in the area of health that he will be most missed.

The Rhode Island chapter of the National Multiple Sclerosis Society, of which Dan McIver was honorary chairman, gives some indication of the scope and the worth of his activity in the health field in the memoriam issue of their monthly publication for March 1966. The article is a fine tribute to one who has done so much for his fellowmen and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include it in this statement.

Mr. Speaker, the immortal Shakespeare in his "Julius Caesar" had a line which appropriately describes Dan McIver:

His life was gentle, and the elements
So mix'd in him that Nature might stand up
And say to the world, "This was a man."

IN MEMORIAM: DANIEL R. McIVER, JANUARY 10,
1909—FEBRUARY 26, 1966

Multiple sclerosis patients, members of the board of trustees, the staff, volunteers, and friends of the Rhode Island Chapter National Multiple Sclerosis Society were deeply saddened to learn of the death of Daniel R. McIver at the age of 57.

Although a victim of multiple sclerosis since the age of 32, Dan managed to live a full and interesting life.

He served the community in which he lived as president of the chamber of commerce and in his position as president of the Orig-

inal Bradford Soap Works was known as a wheelchair executive, a position he held with distinction.

His social life was active and varied. He was a past master councilor of the Providence Order of DeMolay and a past State master councilor of the Rhode Island State Conclave Order of DeMolay. He formed many friendships as a member of Warwick Lodge No. 16 F. & A.M., Moslem Grotto, West Warwick Lions Club, the British Empire Club, Landmark Royal Arch Chapter, and the Narragansett Bay Power Squadron. The 52 Club held special pleasure for him.

This was not enough. He had a mysterious disease and 24 years ago very little was being done about it. So he dedicated a part of his life to doing something about it.

In 1953 he organized the Rhode Island Chapter National Multiple Sclerosis Society and was elected its first chairman, and he served in this capacity until the annual meeting in 1958. At this time a new office, that of honorary chairman, was specifically created for Dan in recognition of his founding of the Rhode Island chapter and "thereafter for his years of faithful leadership and guidance to its present growth and attainments." This was a unique honor for Dan and singularly will remain his alone.

He was invited to be a witness before the Subcommittee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare by Congressman FOGARTY, chairman. His testimony on February 17, 1958, 10 years ago, brought to the fore the need for intensive and expanding research, not only for victims of multiple sclerosis but for all the neurological diseases afflicting mankind.

He pointed out that up to this time the field of neurology was somewhat the stepchild in the medical field. He urged greater recognition of the men; doctors and scientists, in all neurological fields.

The men on that committee not only listened but took action and are continuing year after year to favorably support the recommendations and suggestions so ably made by Dan at the hearing.

More medical schools are being established, greater advances are occurring in the field of research, and more fellowships are available so that young men studying in the field of neurology can be relieved of financial worry and give all their attention to their work.

As the founder of the Rhode Island chapter, Dan's influence has touched every multiple sclerosis patient in Rhode Island. His conviction and courage in the face of his disability was an inspiration to all who knew him and especially so for the afflicted.

There is no measure to what his efforts have meant to everyone concerned with multiple sclerosis throughout the United States.

He inspired a national committee and pointed the direction they must take in the development of programs of assistance for the hundreds of thousands suffering from neurological diseases.

What greater memorial to Dan can there be than the knowledge that he cared enough and fought and brought to fruition much that will continue to alleviate the suffering of the afflicted.

Daniel R. McIver, a gallant and purposeful man will be missed by all who knew him and loved him. The world cannot help but be a better place for his having lived.

MARION L. OLIVER,
Executive Director.

BILL TO ENLIST NATION'S TAXICAB DRIVERS IN WAR AGAINST CRIME

(Mr. WHITE of Texas (at the request of Mr. VIVIAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill designed to

reduce the crime rate in America through a cost-free program. My bill encourages the President to take action through enlisting the support of a fleet of public-spirited citizens who now possess the facilities to render great assistance to our State and local law-enforcement agencies.

I speak of the taxicab drivers and dispatchers of America. These men and women constitute a constantly alert group in every city, moving through the streets and byways. In most areas, taxis are in constant radio contact with their dispatchers. By promptly relaying news of any suspicious incident or infraction of the law, the taxi fleet can notify police of crimes as they actually occur, or when a troublesome situation is brewing. Undoubtedly the apprehension rate would rise and the crime rate would fall.

I am sure that drivers, dispatchers and company managements will be glad to cooperate in a nationwide effort to make our streets and neighborhoods safer, and I look forward to prompt action by the Congress to express confidence in this program.

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION—
BETTER LIGHTING

(Mr. FARNSLEY (at the request of Mr. VIVIAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

- Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I spoke of my intention to introduce a bill requiring the States, in their highway construction programs, to properly illuminate the roads they build. I would like to elaborate further on the desperate need for such lighting.

Although I lament that the research in this field, as in all phases of highway safety, is meager, we do have some positive proof of the benefits of adequate lighting.

In Nashville, Tenn., my neighboring State, the night traffic accident rate declined from 40 to 29 percent following a lighting program, despite a 50-percent increase in motor vehicle registration over the same period of time. A 54-percent decrease in night traffic accidents was noted after the initiation of a comprehensive street lighting program.

The fact that Chicago's Northwest Expressway is continuously lighted over its 16-mile length is alleged to be responsible for the low traffic fatality rate on this highway. In 1961, there were 0.74 deaths per 100 million vehicle miles on the Chicago Expressway, as compared with a national average of 2.3 deaths per 100 million vehicle miles on all expressways.

Between 1953 and 1960, new lights were installed in nine locations in the State of Virginia. A study was made by the Virginia Department of Highways which indicated that the number of traffic accidents at these locations decreased 38 percent and the traffic fatalities dropped 90 percent.

In 1945, a master relighting program was commenced in Kansas City, Mo. During the 3-year period 1945 through 1947, there were 94 pedestrians killed, with 70 at night. An average of 3 per-

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

May 4, 1966

cent of the streets had modern lighting during this period. As the lighting program progressed, the number of pedestrians killed was steadily reduced. During the 3-year period 1954 through 1956, only 44 pedestrians were killed, with 13 at night. An average of 90 percent of the streets were relighted by this time. This is a reduction in night pedestrian accidents of 81 percent. Furthermore, traffic volume studies found 25 percent of travel at night for the city as a whole. At the beginning of the lighting program, nearly 80 percent of the pedestrian deaths were at night, versus less than 30 percent in the "after" period. By 1956, the figure dropped to only 19 percent at night. During the entire 12-year period, an estimated 140 pedestrian lives were saved by the modern lighting.

Mr. Speaker, as I am not a candidate, I would like to state categorically that my interest in illuminating our highways and byways is, unbelievable though it may seem, altruistic. It is strictly for the benefit of the farsighted, weaksighted, undersighted, and normal-sighted American driver, who, unlike the owl, does not see by darkness.

THE STORY OF AMERICAN LABOR—PART IV

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. VIVIAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to command to the attention of our colleagues part IV of "All This Happened," the story of American labor.

This series has been appearing in the Seafarers Log, a publication of the Seafarers International Union, and part IV appeared in the April 1, 1966, edition. Parts I and II appeared in the RECORD of March 30, 1966, pages 6909 through 6911 and part III appeared in the RECORD of March 31, 1966, pages 6985 and 6986.

The article follows:

[Part 4 of a Seafarers Log feature]

ALL THIS HAPPENED: THE STORY OF AMERICAN LABOR

(NOTE.—In spite of its militancy and powerful organization, the AFL was destined to be plagued for many years by its failure to recognize the importance of organizing the ever-increasing numbers of unskilled workers in the Nation's factories. The close of the 19th century saw big business grow even bigger, with huge corporations merging everywhere into monopolistic trusts of staggering size, pulling in staggering profits, and crushing competition ruthlessly. Federal legislation, such as the Sherman Anti-trust Act, hardly disturbed the status quo. Increased mechanization constantly added to the proportion of unskilled workers who remained unorganized—a situation which contributed to the union's defeat in the famous Homestead strike against Carnegie Steel at Homestead, Pa.)

Conditions for American seamen in the mid and late 19th century for the most part, were even worse than the lot of the most ill-treated shoreside worker. Under the complete control of the ship's captain, they could be flogged, imprisoned or starved for the smallest offenses or no offenses at all. For simply quitting his job, a seaman faced charges of desertion. Organizing with other seamen to better his condition could bring charges of mutiny. In addition, the seaman

was continually at the mercy of the "crimps"—brokers who virtually controlled the employment of seamen—and who took most of a seaman's meager pay in return for "services." The sailor was caught between bondage at sea and the vicious crimping system ashore.

The early seamen's organizations met with little success. Those representing seamen in the Great Lakes, grain and ore transport trades, were faced with violent opposition from the powerful steel and other trusts controlling these industries. Several of these early lakes unions, such as the Marine Engineers and the Marine Firemen, Oilers and Water Tenders, survived the antiunion agitation of the corporations. Many others however fell victim to the powerful forces employed against them. The Sailors Union of the Pacific, organized in 1891 by Andrew Furuseth, was the first successful major seamen's union and was the forerunner of a national union of seamen.

In July of 1892 the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers, an AFL union with 25,000 skilled members, sought to negotiate a new contract. Even before the old contract expired, however, the company built a high wooden and barbed-wire fence around the Homestead plant, complete with gun slits and sentry boxes. An across-the-board wage cut was then announced. When the union protested the wage cuts the plant was closed, the workers locked out. Three hundred armed "Pinkerton Flunks" were hired by the company, to be imported from Pennsylvania and landed from barges on a nearby river, like an invasion force. They were intercepted by armed workers, however; and a pitched battle raged for 13 hours on the riverside. Seven workers and three Pinkerton scabs were killed and the barges were prevented from landing.

The company then turned for help to the friendly State government, which ordered 8,000 National Guard troops to take over the whole town. The armed troops then escorted over 2,000 scabs into the struck plant. Thus the strike dragged on into a bleak and cold November. Faced with starvation, unskilled workers who had supported the striking union men went back to work. The union was wrecked. Skilled wages were permanently cut 40 percent, unskilled wages even more.

The more the corporate trusts grew in wealth and power, the more indifferent they became to the condition of American workers. Meanwhile, American labor struggled to weld its many separate elements more firmly to resist this growing corporate power. To do this, labor began its first real attempts to organize workers on an industrywide basis instead of on a strictly craft basis. In this way a strike or strike threat would be made not by just one craft or level of workers within an industry, but would be made instead by all the various craftsmen within the industry at once. The employer could perhaps replace one level of craftsmen with scabs, but could never recruit enough strikebreakers to replace all of his workers on all levels.

The first serious attempt at this kind of organization was made by the American Railway Union under Eugene V. Debs in 1894 and resulted in the famous Pullman strike in that same year which, although it eventually failed to achieve its aims, demonstrated the power inherent in this kind of industrywide organization by succeeding in tying up nearly every railroad in the country.

The vast railroad monopolies of the time were noted for their callous disregard for the welfare of their workers. Among the worst of this bad lot was the Pullman Palace Car Co. of Pullman, Ill., near Chicago. Pullman, Ill., was a town named after the company's founder. Employees had to live in company-owned homes, attend a company-owned church, buy in company-owned stores, get their gas and water from company-owned

supplies. Rent, food, clothing, services, and other costs were deducted by the company directly from workers' paychecks—and the prices were whatever the company decided to charge. Net weekly salaries of only a few cents were not uncommon for Pullman employees, although the company consistently earned fabulous profits.

The ARU was still in its infancy and not yet ready for a fight when the company slashed wages by 25 to 40 percent with no reductions in company-set living costs. The company head, George Pullman, refused even to recognize a grievance committee of workers. The ARU had no choice but to take action, struck the Pullman plant and issued orders to all its member railroad workers across the country not to handle any Pullman cars. The railroad companies, banded together in the General Managers' Association, reacted with wholesale firings of ARU members. The union then had no recourse but to call a general strike against all the Nation's railroads. Scarcely a single railroad car moved in the entire United States.

The sheer brute force which the railroad monopolies brought to bear on the ARU to break the strike was a sign not only of the power they commanded in the Nation through their vast wealth, but also of the unexpected strength of a union organized on an industrywide basis, even though it was less than a year old.

All the railroads in America pooled their huge influence to break the strike. Thousands of scabs were hired to replace striking workers. The U.S. Attorney General, Richard Olney, was called upon for help by the railroad magnates and complied by swearing in over 3,500 "special deputies" armed with clubs and guns to "protect U.S. mail cars." But it was the railroads who paid their salaries of over \$400,000. These armed thugs and goons, recruited from Chicago's dimestore dens, spent most of their time attacking striking workers. Still the ARU held firm. The furious railroad magnates then went straight to the President of the United States for help in breaking the strike. President Grover Cleveland complied by rushing in four companies of the 15th U.S. Infantry. Striking workers were enraged by the appearance of American soldiers and fighting erupted. Stones hurled by workers were answered by rifle bullets and flashing bayonets. Thirty railroad workers were killed in this conflict and many more wounded. But still the ARU held firm.

When all else failed, the railroad operators called on the courts for help in breaking the strike. A Federal Court injunction was issued against the ARU, Debs, other strike leaders and "all others" involved in the strike, forbidding all strike activity, including peaceful picketing by "all and sundred persons whomsoever * * *." It was the "blanket" injunction to end all blanket injunctions. Debs and hundreds of other strikers and strike leaders were arrested and jailed for violating the injunction. Without leadership the strike crumbled and the ARU was destroyed, still in its infancy.

Big business adopted the blanket injunction as its chief antiunion weapon for years to come—it had proved that effective. But American labor had also discovered a potent weapon through the Pullman strike—the industrywide organization of workers. The 19th century closed with labor suffering a serious defeat but learning an invaluable lesson which it would use to great effect during the 20th century.

(Mr. FASCELL (at the request of Mr. VIVIAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. FASCELL'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

May 4, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2419

this point that a new source of support for our cultural life has come into being, and it is one which will be taking encouraging and effective action. Of course, sufficient financing of these efforts is essential but has not yet been forthcoming. If Congress is as generous in providing funds for these endowments as it was wise in legislating them into existence, I believe we can look forward to seeing some interesting and important results from this new venture of the Federal Government into the neglected one of the two cultures.

Foremost among these results will be refocusing on those values which give our lives purpose and direction. As I indicated before, we have entered an era in which mankind—and particularly individual man—will have a growing need for an inner strength, for a feeling of worth and fulfillment, and for an appreciation of the things in life which, shared or experienced alone, make life worth living. The arts and the humanities offer many of these more evasive necessities of life, supplementing those others supplied more abundantly today by science and technology.

The new support of the arts and humanities by the Federal Government should help break down some of the artificial barriers we have created between the world of science and technology and that of the arts and humanities. I call them artificial because I think we have created them to some extent only by our words and deeds and can remove them by new outlooks and attitudes.

I believe these barriers are partly the result of our desire to conveniently categorize and catalog our ideas and activities. But though science may have a pervading and ascending influence in our lives today, there cannot be any clearcut division between science and nonscience in interdisciplinary civilization which a liveable future world will require. The growing overlapping of cultures becomes obvious to those who care to pause and look for it. Some people, apprehensive over the rate and degree of change brought about by our applications of science, talk of science as if it were a force apart from man. What they tend to overlook is the simple fact that science is after all a human endeavor and that it does not exist independent of man. We must not forget that in overall history science has, so far, done more to "humanize" than to "dehumanize" man.

In trying to separate science from other aspects of our lives many tend to overlook the large areas of direct interplay between science and technology and the humanities and arts. As most of you know, science has become a valuable tool of the humanities. In the fields of history and archeology it has provided remarkable means in helping us to discover and analyze many traces of our past. Such techniques as carbon-14 dating, the use of the proton magnetometer and neutron activation analysis are today helping to reveal much new knowledge about our ancestors and their various civilizations.

A unique new example of the symbiosis of science and the humanities may bring together, in a most unusual endeavor, the most unlikely partners, high energy physics and egyptology. This proposed project, in which high energy physics (a field not yet having many direct practical applications) may help archeologists, is one involving the search for a possible hidden burial chamber in Chephren's Pyramid, one of the great Egyptian pyramids built about 4,500 years ago.

In addition to bringing together widely divergent disciplines, the project would be one of international cooperation bringing together physicists and archeologists of the United States and the United Arab Republic. Those who would be involved are Dr. Luis Alvarez and his staff at the University of California Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at Berkeley, Dr. F. El Bedewi, nuclear physicist

of Ein Shams University in Cairo, and Dr. A. Fakry, archeologist and well-known authority on the pyramids from the United Arab Republic Department of Antiquities.

In this high energy physics approach to archeology, originally proposed by Dr. Alvarez, the plan is to use cosmic ray "muons," occurring naturally from space, and high energy particle detection equipment to literally X-ray the great pyramid. Through the use of a spark chamber, placed in a known subterranean burial chamber beneath the pyramid, it is possible to detect the muons penetrating the pyramid's walls. Any voids within the pyramid will be manifested by a greater number of muons being recorded by the spark chamber.

Through this method the scientists and archeologists hope to discover and map out in a nondestructive manner the location of the hidden chamber they believe exists somewhere in the huge structure. This suggested project, I think, is an outstanding example of science in the service of the humanities, helping man to solve some of his past and present mysteries.

Of course, the pyramid project is a specific, isolated example of the symbiosis I referred to earlier, but the integration of our two cultures is also underway in more general terms. One indication of this—oddly enough again involving high energy physics—relates to the search for a site for the AEC's proposed 200 Bev. accelerator.

As you well know, the possibility of having a scientific laboratory of such importance and economic impact in their area has created keen competition among many communities across the Nation. What is less well known—but has even greater significance—is the unexpected effect of this competition on the various communities.

The process of assembling information brought together in each community an unusually broad group of local leaders, State officials, university presidents, professional men from a number of fields, and industrialists. Immediately there resulted a cross-politization of ideas, an exchange of views, a frank discussion of problems—in short, these communities engaged in an unprecedented self-appraisal. In many cases, I think the people were led to see some of the hitherto unrecognized assets and shortcomings of their area.

As local resources were being mustered, it suddenly dawned on community leaders that the overall attractiveness of an area must be measured by factors which transcend economic considerations. Critics of intellectual and cultural activities were transformed into champions when it became evident that a strong academic base and a broad cultural environment were more highly regarded than amusement parks or dog racing. University presidents suddenly found that their pleas for understanding of long-range goals—pleas that had long been ignored—were blossoming into legislative appropriations. In some cases for the first time in history, legislatures specifically earmarked appropriations for their university's research programs.

This local self-appraisal brought a greater interest in racial harmony. It brought renewed support for education at every level. It brought a greater appreciation for the public library, the symphony, and even children's ballet classes.

The very process of assembling information opened important new channels of communications within the community. And if the people can maintain their momentum, not only will the community be a better place in which to live—it will be in a stronger position to compete for other scientific or technical installations.

Our site search has, I think, helped in another way which is important to me personally. It has helped change the public image of the scientist from a cold, detached individual to that of a very human person with a

deep interest in his family and in his community.

All of this indicates, then, that the two cultures are, indeed, becoming integrated, and this will be mutually beneficial to each.

Finally, as part of the new blending of scientific, social and cultural interests which seems to be forthcoming today, and in turn influencing it, I think we may see in our country a new rise in the quality of leadership. This should come about as, in this process of better balancing human values with the growth of science and technology, we develop men and women who have both the broad social outlook and the knowledge to make the practical day-to-day decisions in keeping with that outlook.

Perhaps also in a society which fosters this combination of wisdom and knowledge, and which tries to keep its focus on individual human values within an evergrowing nation, we will be able to develop some immunity to the "Anti-Leadership Vaccine" which John W. Gardner has described so effectively as one of today's new problems in education.

To me, all these aspects of our new awareness, and the new actions we are taking as a result of it, are signs of an important new period of maturity for our country, and I believe they will not only reflect in our building of a Great Society here but will have a profound influence in our relations throughout the world.

In October of 1963, the late President Kennedy flew to Amherst College in Massachusetts to participate in a ceremony honoring the poet Robert Frost. I think that the talk he gave at that ceremony best reflects what most Americans feel should be the goals of this country and our role in the world. And since it bears so profoundly on what I have been trying to say tonight, I would like to conclude by quoting some of this most impressive statement.

"I look forward to a great future for America, a future in which our country will match its military strength with our moral restraint, its wealth with our wisdom, its power with our purpose.

"I look forward to an America which will not be afraid of grace and beauty, which will protect the beauty of our natural environment, which will preserve the great American houses and squares and parks of our national past, and which will build handsome and balanced cities for our future.

"I look forward to an America which will reward achievement in the arts as we reward achievement in business or statecraft.

"I look forward to an America which commands respect throughout the world not only for its strength, but for its civilization as well. And, I look forward to a world which will be safe not only for democracy and diversity, but, also, for personal distinction."

VN
VietnamEXTENSION OF REMARKS
OFHON. THOMAS N. DOWNING
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1966

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, public debate over our course in Vietnam is increasing and intensifying.

In our democratic society we have always promoted lively discussion of national policy issues and differences of opinion are considered to be healthy in the United States.

It is, however, important, I believe, to put public debate and public differences

A2420

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 4, 1966

of opinion in the proper perspective—particularly in Vietnam where the war between the two Vietnams challenges not only our military might but also our commitment to freedom.

Putting the Vietnam war in perspective is not an easy task but the national commander of the American Legion, the Honorable L. Eldon James, who has personally visited Vietnam, recently analyzed the discussion of opinion over Vietnam in an address before the Legion's Department of Pennsylvania annual banquet. His address comprises one of the finest statements on our Nation's commitments in Vietnam that I have ever seen and under unanimous consent I include Commander James' talk in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The address follows:

AN ADDRESS BY L. ELDON JAMES, NATIONAL COMMANDER, THE AMERICAN LEGION, AT THE DEPARTMENT OF PENNSYLVANIA ANNUAL BANQUET HONORING THE NATIONAL COMMANDER, PITTSBURGH, PA., APRIL 29, 1966

Tonight I want to talk about something that concerns every individual who respects the dignity of other individuals and who desires freedom for himself and for his fellow man.

It is Vietnam.

Since my visit to South Vietnam last October, in all of my talks—averaging three a day and sometimes numbering as high as seven—I have sought to put this matter in its proper perspective and to bolster public support for our Government's efforts. I will not take your time to stress the need for such support. I am sure that the members of this audience are well informed generally on the relationship of the Vietnam struggle to our own national security. I will not attempt here to detail the many other ways in which the American Legion is backing the administration's Vietnam policy. We are very proud of our continuing support programs, but in my remarks tonight I want to rifle in on one particular aspect of the Vietnam problem; specifically, the conflict that exists between the President's position on Vietnam and that of his chief senatorial critic, J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT.

It is not, in my judgment, the proper business of the American Legion to concern itself with personalities. I have no intention of doing so tonight. Senator FULBRIGHT, however, is chairman of the influential Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and he personally enjoys considerable prestige, here at home and abroad. Because of his position and his following, and because he takes sharp issue with the administration's policy on this vital matter, it is important that all concerned Americans inform themselves on the Senator's Vietnam position.

The American Legion's understanding of the nature of the Vietnamese conflict and of our country's involvement is in complete harmony with that of the administration. On the other hand, we find ourselves in complete disagreement with Mr. FULBRIGHT's present conception of the nature and significance of that conflict, and with his proposed solution.

We respect the man and his office. But because of his position in the Senate we are concerned about his views on this and other foreign policy issues.

Actually what is going on in Vietnam and why? How one answers these questions makes all the difference between what we believe and what the Senator from Arkansas chooses to believe.

On the surface, we know that—half a world away—a relatively small nation is engaged, within its borders, in a desperate struggle against the agents of the government of another small adjoining nation. The acts of

those agents take the form of systematic political assassination, sabotage, terrorism, guerrilla raids, and even small-scale warfare. In spite of the high casualty rates on both sides, the basic character of the struggle is political, rather than military.

If one did not know more than this about the situation there, the war between the two Vietnams might be shrugged off or dismissed as just another sorry chapter in the long history of mankind's inhumanity to itself. In fact, some persons—including Mr. FULBRIGHT—insist that what is going on in South Vietnam is only a "civil war."

That the eyes of the rest of the world are affixed to the Vietnamese struggle is good evidence that it is not merely one more "dirty little war." It is that, true enough, but it is much more. The evidence for this is confirmed when we realize that some 35 free-world governments openly are providing, or have pledged, assistance—military, economic, or technical—to one of the combatants, South Vietnam; while its adversary, North Vietnam, is being aided and abetted by the two rivals for the leadership of the Communist world, Red China and the U.S.S.R.

Placed in its proper perspective, the fighting in Vietnam can only be identified as a major part of the total Communist conspiracy to control the world. Those who believe otherwise seemingly are unaware of the history of the Communist movement, including the pertinent pronouncements of its leaders. And, I'm not speaking here of just those leaders who are deceased—such as Lenin and Stalin; I include the announced intentions of those Communist leaders on the current scene, particularly in Peking.

Those who seriously suggest that the United States and other free world governments have no business in Vietnam—that it is not our fight, and that we should get out—make the mistake (if we give them the benefit of all doubt) of viewing Vietnam as an isolated matter. It is not an isolated matter. It is a clear-cut case of Communist aggression—aggression which is directed from Hanoi, underwritten largely by Peking, and openly encouraged by Moscow. At the recently concluded 23rd Soviet Communist Party Congress in Moscow, the current Kremlin leaders boasted about the amount and kind of war materiel they are supplying North Vietnam, and complained that Russia would do more were it not for the roadblocks which Red China has put in the way of overland transhipments.

But even while Peking and Moscow are hurling invective messages at one another, their rivalry over who is helping Hanoi the most adds up, in effect, to cooperation in the total Communist effort to take South Vietnam over by force. After all, Communists everywhere make no attempt to hide the fact that Vietnam is a classic example of what they call "wars of national liberation," the very type of war which Khrushchev blandly admitted Russia would continue to support, as part of its policy of peaceful coexistence with the West.

General Giap, North Vietnam's defense minister and one of communism's leading experts on guerrilla warfare, stated the issue bluntly when he said: "South Vietnam is the model of the national liberation movement of our time. * * * If the special warfare that the U.S. imperialists are testing in South Vietnam is overcome, then it can be defeated anywhere in the world." Does Mr. FULBRIGHT deny that this statement was made, or that it was made seriously? Or does he deny its relevance, or what?

It is also a verifiable fact that the so-called National Liberation Front for South Vietnam was created in Hanoi and still takes its directions from there. The Vietcong, now heavily reinforced by North Vietnamese regulars, is the fighting arm of the Front. As Secretary of Defense McNamara testified

last week, before Mr. FULBRIGHT's committee, the Vietcong takes its orders from Hanoi on an hour-to-hour basis.

To call the Vietnamese struggle a civil war, as does Mr. FULBRIGHT, one would have to ignore the fact that the Geneva accord of 1954 created two separate Vietnams, one avowedly Communist, the other non-Communist. Recall this: Right after the agreement, over 1 million citizens of North Vietnam promptly "voted with their feet," and joined their free countrymen in South Vietnam; less than 100,000 moved from the south to the Communist-controlled portion in the north.

Incredible as it seems, Mr. FULBRIGHT not only ignores this history, he does not concede that there is aggression from the north. As late as last week, his questioning of Secretary McNamara suggests that the "civil war" he has in mind is confined to South Vietnam. He does admit, however, that the Vietcong do receive "moral support and external physical support—from the Chinese."

Nevertheless, the Senator does not see the Vietnam problem as a Communist-inspired conflict. He contends that the entire problem was basically a nationalistic movement, but that the United States—by its intervention—turned the matter into a conflict of ideologies involving communism. Furthermore, he stated in his March 1 speech on the floor of the Senate, that "our presence itself is the principal reason for much of the activity" on the part of the enemy. (I wonder if the proximity of the United States to Cuba was the principal reason why Khrushchev clandestinely introduced missiles there, capable of destroying our cities as far away from Cuba as Minneapolis and St. Paul—as well as all others in between—including Pittsburgh and the very room in which we are gathered tonight.)

At any rate, Mr. FULBRIGHT's view as to the cause of the enemy's activity in Vietnam would seem to gloss over the considerable record of Vietcong infiltration and atrocities prior to any significant U.S. presence. President Kennedy's 1961 agreement to provide military advisers for South Vietnam's armed forces was a result, not a cause, of such activity. As late as 12 months ago, our total military presence—still in an advisory role—was less than 30,000. Again, the change in that role, and the tremendous buildup in our combat forces beginning last May, was a result, not a cause, of increasing Communist aggression.

Mr. FULBRIGHT takes particular exception to the administration's use of the term "Communist aggression" to describe what is going on in South Vietnam. He says it "offends" him, according to an interview reported in last week's issue of Look magazine.

Simultaneously, Newsweek quoted Thich Tri Quang—leader of the militant Buddhists in South Vietnam—as saying if peace could be achieved in Vietnam, it should come as "the result of a victory over the Communists," rather than through negotiations with them.

Which view is the correct one? Without intending to endorse Tri Quang in every respect, we think he is well qualified to know the truth of the matter; he was once a part of the Viet Minh, forerunner to the Vietcong. He now refers to himself as his country's "spiritual leader." The same article quotes him as rejecting the notion that the National Liberation Front, after it discontinues armed activity, take part in a South Vietnamese Government. On this point, Tri Quang stated: "No Communist Party can be a real political party. No Communist Party can live in harmony with other political parties. Furthermore, the Nationalist Parties in Vietnam are still weak and could not cope with the Communist Party if it were allowed to join" a national assembly.

Again, it would appear that Tri Quang understands the Communists very well.

May 4, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2421

On the other hand, Senator FULBRIGHT'S comprehension of the international Communist movement may be less than realistic. In his first Senate speech in 1945, he referred to the fear of communism as nothing more than a "powerful prejudice." He went on to add: "As I read history, the Russian experiment in socialism is scarcely more radical under modern conditions than the Declaration of Independence was in the days of George III."

As we read FULBRIGHT today, we cannot find that his understanding of communism has progressed in the least.

Just as we differ with the Senator's views regarding the nature of the war in Vietnam, we also disagree with his solution—or should I say solutions—for a settlement.

In his March 1 remarks to the Senate, Mr. FULBRIGHT proposed at least three different approaches on the part of the United States for achieving a settlement.

He appears to favor the complete withdrawal of our military, and states that this would be "of great value as an incentive to the Chinese and North Vietnamese in leading to a settlement." I'm sure this action on our part would be of great value to the Communists, and it definitely would lead to the kind of settlement they have in mind.

At another point in those remarks, the Senator makes clear his feeling that the United States should negotiate with the Vietcong.

Then again-looking to an arrangement with Red China for the future of all of south-east Asia—Mr. FULBRIGHT proposes that we "entrench ourselves in powerful bases on the coast of Vietnam or inland where appropriate." He believes that Red China would then agree to guarantee the neutrality of all the small states of the area, in return for our giving up these bases. He does not tell us what the Vietcong and North Vietnam regulars would be doing to the rest of South Vietnam while we are encircled in our fortified enclaves.

It is a curious thing that each of these three proposals completely ignores the rights, desires, and needs of the South Vietnamese. By what authority, for example, could we proceed to entrench our forces on South Vietnam's territory, while awaiting talks with Peiping over the destiny of the entire region, without regard to the feelings of the nations concerned?

Our forces are there, at the request of the Government of South Vietnam, to participate actively in the defense of that country. If we were to employ them in the manner and for the purpose suggested by Mr. FULBRIGHT, I feel sure that the South Vietnamese leaders would tell us to leave.

In the larger sense, it is true that we have objectives beyond keeping South Vietnam free. That is, we are engaged in a multi-lateral effort to convince North Vietnam that it cannot take its neighbor over by force, and to convince the Communist world generally that any additional "wars of national liberation," which it might sponsor, are also doomed to failure. But, in our pursuit of these larger objectives, we cannot ignore the wishes of the people and the government of the country to which we have given our solemn commitment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT'S monumental indifference to the welfare and national aspirations of the free people of South Vietnam is best seen in his recent observation, quoted in Look, that if we had not "stuck our nose in this business, it would have long since been settled in accordance with whatever the major forces in Vietnam were." Agreed; but what a blood bath that would have produced. (It has been estimated that the North Vietnamese, if they ever take over in the south, will massacre as many as 4 million people, starting, of course, with all those who fled from communism's grip following the 1954 partitioning.)

Actually, Mr. FULBRIGHT goes further. He suggests that a Titoist form of communism for all of Vietnam—both North and South—might be more in our interest than for us to achieve our goal of a free South Vietnam with a democratic form of government. His reasoning here is that, a Vietnam on the Yugoslavian model would amount to a "buffer state" against China; whereas, because it would be relatively weak and defenseless, a free South Vietnam would remain a tempting target for Red China if, says the Senator, that country "does become really aggressive in the military sense."

This argument leaves us cold. He sees Communist China only as a potential threat to the free nations on its periphery. His refusal to concede that Peiping is today the real power behind the military aggression being carried on by Hanoi and the Vietcong, against free Vietnam, also seems inconsistent with his previously expressed views on Red China. In his "Bridges East and West" speech of December 8, 1964, the Senator referred to Peiping's expansionist ambitions and agreed with the U.S. policy of diplomatic, military, and economic containment of the Communist Chinese. He further stated that we should withhold proposals for accommodation until mainland China's leaders "abandon their policies of aggression and subversion."

It is regrettable, I believe, that Senator FULBRIGHT has not yet seen fit to visit South Vietnam and to become acquainted with the Vietnamese. I am sure he would find, as I did, that they are a proud, sensitive, friendly, intelligent, and deserving people. He would also find them fiercely determined to carry on their struggle to remain free. Barring a visit to Vietnam, I wish the Senator could read the letters we are receiving from GI's over there, or talk with those who have served with and among the Vietnamese.

Our men and women serving the cause of freedom in Vietnam know that the Vietnamese people are worthy of our efforts. They also know that they are fighting for something more than Vietnam alone. There is published in the current issue of the American Legion magazine, a letter from a sergeant now serving with the 1st Air Cavalry Division, in Vietnam. This GI says, in part, "Everyone here realizes that we are fighting for the survival of freemen everywhere."

It is also regrettable that Mr. FULBRIGHT has undergone such a reversal of opinion on the U.S. commitment to Vietnam since he delivered his well-publicized "Old Myths and New Realities" speech of March 25, 1964. He then told the Senate:

"It seems clear that only two realistic options are open to us in Vietnam in the immediate future: the expansion of the conflict in one way or another, or a renewed effort to bolster the capacity of the South Vietnamese to prosecute the war successfully on its present scale. The matter calls for thorough examination by responsible officials in the executive branch; and until they have had an opportunity to evaluate the contingencies and feasibilities of the options open to us, it seems to me that we have no choice but to support the South Vietnamese Government and Army by the most effective means available. Whatever specific policy decisions are made, it should be clear to all concerned that the United States will continue to meet its obligations and fulfill its commitments with respect to Vietnam."

At that stage, we think the Senator was correct.

Later in 1964, Mr. FULBRIGHT supported the Tonkin Gulf resolution whereby the Congress approved and supported the President's determination "to take any and all necessary measures" to repel aggression. The Senator was, in fact, floor manager for the resolution, which was adopted with only two dissenting votes out of the entire Congress.

Now, however, Mr. FULBRIGHT feels we should follow a policy of "deescalation aimed at negotiation and an accommodation among the parties to the South Vietnamese civil war." The quote is from his remarks of March 1, 1966, on the floor of the Senate. By accommodation, it is clear from the remainder of his statement that he means what he said in his "Bridges East and West" speech of December 8, 1964; that is, "compromises that respect the vital interests of both sides." In this same connection, he admitted that this would require us to make concessions to the Communists, "however distasteful" these concessions might be to us.

Brushing aside the seeming contradiction in terms here (that is, between making distasteful concessions on the one hand, and upholding our vital interests on the other), we are not prepared to agree that the Communists have any vital interests in South Vietnam, certainly none which deserve to be respected.

The basic issue at stake is that of freedom versus slavery—and not just in South Vietnam alone. Should the Communist strategy of "wars of national liberation" be even moderately successful in South Vietnam, we will soon see a repeat performance, on a new and larger scale, in Thailand and elsewhere—this hemisphere included.

We vigorously reject Senator FULBRIGHT'S Vietnam position. We strongly endorse President Johnson's viewpoint when he said—in his John Hopkins University speech last April—"Let no one think for a moment that retreat from Vietnam would bring an end to conflict. The central lesson of our time is that the appetite of aggression is never satisfied." And, as he has said repeatedly, "To stand firm is the only guarantee of a lasting peace."

The American Legion is convinced that we must stand firm in Vietnam, and must keep up and even increase the military pressure on the Communists, in order that our own vital interests will be preserved. We must never fear to escalate the cause of freedom.

Today the minority view seems to get the spotlight and all the headlines. Unless the vast majority of Americans who feel strongly on this matter stand up to be counted and speak up to be heard, the world may well believe that we are divided and that the dissembler's view is the prevailing one.

I know it is easy to let George do it but, in a matter of this importance, we cannot rely on chance; we must do the job ourselves. I believe it is important that each of you do all that you can to let the world know that the overwhelming majority of thinking Americans are determined in their resolve to support our Government's efforts to defend freedom and to stop the advance of communism. It is as simple as that. We must not confuse the details of how with the overriding importance of why—the objective being the preservation and the promotion of world peace.

It is up to you.

Poland: 1,000 Years of Christianity

SPEECH
OF

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, 1966 marks the 1,000th anniversary of Poland's conversion to Christianity. The significance of this solemn event to the Polish people was demonstrated on April 16, when thousands of people

A2422

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 4, 1966

flocked to hear Poland's great religious leader, Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski. They thus showed that the Communist government leaders, despite their opposition to Cardinal Wyszynski and the church, cannot erase the deeply religious sentiments of a great people.

Christianity was introduced into Poland in 966. In that year Poland's first historically known ruler, Mieszko I, married a Christian princess from Bohemia named Dobrava. Mieszko's conversion enabled him to place Poland under the protection of the Pope and thus to stem a threatened German invasion. Mieszko's son, Boleslaw the Mighty, established many Christian bishoprics and extended Polish dominion from the Oder and Neisse Rivers in the west to the Dnieper River in the east.

Poland's religious traditions have helped to link her to the West for countless generations. It is my strong belief that Poland's cultural and religious traditions and her love of liberty and national independence will someday triumph over the forces of oppression. Let us do all we can to hasten that day.

Sea-Grant Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1966

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining a number of my colleagues in filing a bill to establish a national system of sea-grant colleges. Its purpose is to provide improved ways to make use of the ocean's vast, virtually untapped resources. The idea is analogous to the land-grant college concept and our belief is that such a program would create the same rapid growth in marine sciences that the land-grant college provided for agriculture.

The bill has five major provisions. The first would authorize funds to be made available to colleges and universities to expand practical education in the marine sciences. In a few instances new colleges might be formed, but ordinarily programs would be founded or expanded in existing institutions with an interest in the sea.

Funds would also be available to support a relatively neglected aspect of our marine science program—applied research. These funds would be used to bridge the gap between the basic research that is now being done and technologically useful developments. This part of the program would pay off quickly in economic terms for this country. Programs that could be supported would be, for example, shellfish research, research in fishing techniques, marine conservation, pollution control, fish farming, and desalination.

Another major program provided by the bill is a service similar to that of the Agricultural Extension Service. It would provide lectures and demonstrations at the local level to disseminate useful in-

formation to those working or interested in the marine sciences. The beneficiaries of this part of the program would be not only scientists, but also fishermen, who could learn about new fishing areas, gear, and techniques. Such a program would meet a long-felt need in this country. We have made many advances in the marine sciences but often have been unable to put them to immediate practical use because the ultimate users have not had access to the information.

Development of the Continental Shelf is vital to any national oceanographic program. This bill facilitates use and study of the Continental Shelf by setting aside certain appropriate areas of the submerged lands for the use of participants in the program.

This legislation is designed to encourage the creation and expansion of regional centers of excellence in marine science fields. Such centers would be of enormous economic value to the areas where they are located. The interplay of ideas and pool of technicians and scientists that would be drawn to such areas would foster cross-fertilization of ideas and rapid growth.

Funds for this program would come, not from taxes, but 10 percent of all royalties, rentals, and other sums that are paid to the Federal Government for the use of the Continental Shelf. It is estimated that the total of these royalties in 1966 will be \$270 million. This seems to be an appropriate way of financing the sea grant system. Moreover, the funds will be likely to grow along with the program, since exploitation of the Continental Shelf is likely to increase in future years.

Grants could be given not only to educational institutions but also to any public or private agency, any foundation, laboratory, corporation, industry, or even group of individuals which plans to operate a program under the provisions of this bill. The broad range of beneficiaries is in my view one of the bill's strongest points. One of the weaknesses of oceanography in this country has been that it has been largely a government operation. However, this bill would bring in many diverse groups. Our national program will be strengthened by the participation of many segments of our society—each has something to contribute as well as to gain.

On a recent trip to Russia for the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I was struck by Russian capability in applied oceanography. My impressions were confirmed by scientists in this country who say that although we still lead the Russians in basic oceanographic research, we are lagging in applied research. Moreover, the Russians appear to have two or three times as many people as we do in the ocean sciences. Each scientist in the Soviet Union has more technicians to back him up than do our scientists. The bill I am filing today would meet three of the most pressing needs of our oceanographic program—particularly in the light of the Soviet challenge—applied research, dissemination of information to users, and provision of more personnel, especially ocean technicians.

To understand how the bill could work,

let us take for example a center of excellence in oceanography such as exists today in southeastern Massachusetts, having Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution as its focal point. The fact that this institution is located in an area where the people have historically looked seaward means that interest in oceanography is high.

My office constantly receives requests from this area for information on careers in oceanography, and a number of educational institutions are presently sounding out plans for oceanography curricula. In fact at this very moment I have on my desk a plan proposed by a group of marine scientists and other responsible citizens for a vocational training school for ocean technicians in the Cape Cod area to meet the demands of Woods Hole for such technicians.

Southeastern Massachusetts Technical Institute is a school ideally situated for an oceanography curriculum on the outskirts of New Bedford. It is a young and rapidly growing institution which could provide an invaluable service to both community and country by teaching oceanography. Preliminary development plans for oceanography have just been approved by the trustees. The interest is there—with adequate funding, a great deal could be done.

Another place where oceanography could be developed is in the high schools. A rather unique pilot project has been approved for the town of Falmouth in my district, introducing oceanography into the high school curriculum.

Apart from these educational institutions with an interest in oceanography, there are independent laboratories and businesses with ocean science orientation in this area. The energy, motivation, and talent to build important and imaginative oceanographic programs already exists in southeastern Massachusetts as I am sure it does in other such centers across the country. With this solid foundation the sea grant college system could produce a rapid flowering of developments in the marine sciences.

Education is the key to the sea grant college bill. The education that we provide today will determine the state of our marine sciences tomorrow. On education rests the future of our national oceanographic program.

VISTA Volunteers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1966

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, last month the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky paid special tribute to the 119 VISTA volunteers who have dedicated themselves to serving the people of our hollows and mountain communities. Without a single dissenting vote, the entire house of representatives passed a special resolution commending these VISTA volun-